

Chapter 1 Newsletter

Vol. 3 No. 1

January 1986

Wanted: Successful Montana Chapter 1 Projects

The Chapter 1 office has been pleasantly surprised and encouraged by the nominations which were submitted for the secretary's initiative to identify successful Chapter 1 projects. Interest shown by Montana school districts was outstanding. It was great to see so many school districts who are proud of their Chapter 1 programs and are willing to share them with other Chapter 1 school districts.

Project nominations have been screened and five were selected to be submitted to the secretary's office. The Montana nominations and those from other states will be rated by a review panel in Washington. Each panel consists of professionals from a variety of backgrounds. It is hoped that each state will be notified in March of the selections.

For those of you who took the time to complete the nomination form to participate in this initiative, we, the Chapter 1 office, would like to thank each of you for your time and effort. It was outstanding to see so many projects nominated. We wish the projects submitted to Washington the best of luck in the competition.

Computers! Software!

Computers in the classroom have become an accepted part of the American educational scene. Indicators are that they do enhance student learning. Many of the Montana ECIA Chapter 1 projects are now involved with computer-assisted instruction (CAI). Technical assistance when purchasing hardware (the mechanical parts) and training for personnel (the human parts) seems to be available and well utilized. The most difficult and complex computer integration step appears to be the acquisition of appropriate software (the instructional parts).

The process of choosing software can be confusing and is, at best, time consuming. Thousands of computer programs are available for purchase, and many more programs may be obtained through copying public domain programs. Many excellent programs are available, and a selection process should be utilized that will reject programs that are not appropriate. Following a consistent pattern may assist in streamlining the computer software selection process.

The primary consideration when purchasing software must be the curricular and instructional needs of the students. Define levels and skills before looking for software.

Observe whether the software is consistent with good educational practices and research results. Also, observe whether the software will complement teacher instruction. Since Chapter 1 students are already behind their peers and time is limited, entertainment and reward are a waste of computer capabilities. Good programs exist that will entertain, reward and teach.

Choose programs that are more effectively taught with a computer than by other means. Computers have unique capabilities that should be utilized and should not become mere electronic page turners and worksheets.

Look for clarity of instructions, coordinated level of instruction, and directions (some first grade level instruction sports fifth grade level directions), user friendly documentation (accompanying instructional brochure), and material that is factually and grammatically correct.

Preview all software to: a) see if the program works, b) see how the program works, and c) make a preview record so that specific information is recorded concerning grade level, skills taught, general operation, use requirements, advantages, publisher, etc. This will aid in avoiding duplicate purchasing, reducing teacher review time, encouraging appropriate program use and accounting for the software.

Procure and file a backup copy of all disks and all documentation. Students and teachers may damage or lose either. The instructions are vital to continued appropriate use of disks. Copyright law does allow for a backup copy, but many programs cannot be copied. Backup copies can often be purchased at minimal cost. Developers and publishers of software have a right to obtain fair prices for software development. Pirating and illegally copying for more than backup file copies will eventually discourage the development of good software with teachers and students being the eventual losers.

Software Reviews and Office of Public Instruction Preview Center

Many educational publications feature software reviews from an educational perspective (which may not be the same as the publisher's advertising). Most software has limitations, but may be very appropriate in one setting while inappropriate in another. Reading reviews may aid in sorting out programs prior to the actual preview process. Remember, do not hesitate to reject programs that do not appear to be appropriate.

The following publications contain regular features that deal with computers and software reviews:

The Reading Teacher K-6	— "Computer Software," "The Printout"
Journal of Reading 7-12	— "Computer Software"
Mathematics Teacher	— "Courseware Review"
Instructor and Teacher	— "Computer Corner"
Language Arts	— "On Line"
Science and Children	— "Resource Reviews"
Curriculum Review	— "Computer Center"
Media & Methods	— "Software Review"
Learning	— "Using Computers"
Library Journal	— Computer subsection

Additional software reviews are available in the Computer Preview Center at the Office of Public Instruction's Resource Center. Software is also available to preview in the Resource Center. Appointments should be made in advance to ensure availability of materials. Call Rosemary Riddock, 444-2678, or call the OPI toll free hot line 1-800-332-3402 and Rosemary will return your call.

Recent Audit Findings and Regulations

On October 19, 1984, Congress enacted the Single Audit Act of 1984, Public Law 98-502, which establishes uniform audit requirements for state and local governments receiving federal financial assistance. The Act is applicable to all federal programs, including those authorized by the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981.

The following audit findings or audit exceptions are the result of recent audits of ECIA Chapter 1 programs in other states and the final determination was the repayment of misused funds.

1. Finding

—The local education agency (LEA) allocated salary costs to different programs on the basis of annual budget estimates.

—Salaries of joint-funded personnel were not supported by appropriate time and attendance records and time distribution records.

Recommendation

—Establish and implement a time distribution system to support salary and fringe benefit charges.

2. Finding

—Chapter 1 services supplanted services that would have been provided from state and local funds in the absence of Chapter 1.

—Chapter 1 aides spent 25 percent of their time providing health and social services that were general aid.

—Health and social services were services the LEA was required to provide for both Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 students.

Recommendation

—The LEA must take steps to establish controls to ensure that services are designed to meet the needs of educationally deprived students and not the general needs of the LEA, schools or entire class.

3. Finding

—Teachers and aides spent non-classroom time (preparation periods) on personal activities, i.e., reading, writing letters, resting.

Recommendation

—The LEA must establish work schedules in an efficient, economical and equitable manner and implement controls to monitor the efficient use of personnel paid with grant funds.

4. Finding

—Teachers and aides provided services to non-Chapter 1 students.

Recommendation

—The LEA must establish controls to ensure that only properly selected students receive Chapter 1 services.

5. Finding

—An LEA incurred unnecessary food and lodging cost for Chapter 1 inservice.

—Training was held within commuting distance of the district, and food and lodging costs were imprudent and unnecessary.

—Travel, food, lodging and registration costs were incurred for attendance at conferences and meetings that were not directly related to Chapter 1.

Recommendation

—The LEA must establish controls to ensure that unnecessary training and conference costs are not incurred.

6. Finding

—The LEA did not have prior approval for equipment purchases.

Recommendation

—The LEA obtain and have documentation of approval for all equipment purchased.

7. Finding

—Chapter 1 employees were used to perform non-Chapter 1 functions.

Recommendation

—The LEA must be aware of federal regulations governing the use of Chapter 1 personnel for non-Chapter 1 function and establish schedules accordingly.

Chapter 1 Evaluation

Many inquiries have been received for information about the norming dates for new norm-referenced tests and new test editions. The following fall and spring norm dates were provided by the Northwest Regional Education Laboratory:

Test	Edition	Norm Dates
California Achievement Test	1985	Oct. 20 May 4
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills	1985	Oct. 31 April 30
Metropolitan Achievement Test, Survey Battery	1985	Oct. 15 April 22
The National Test of Basic Skills	1985	Oct. 17 April 24
SRA Survey of Basic Skills	1985	Oct. 5 April 11
Tests of Achievement and Proficiency	1985	Oct. 31 Apr. 30

Earlier editions of the tests listed above (i.e., 1977, 1978) will not be approved for Chapter 1 evaluation for the 1987-88 school year.

During the school year 1983-84, the Montana Chapter 1 program served 8,547 pupils in reading and 4,866 pupils in math.

Education Department Issues Guidelines for Chapter 1 Programs

The Education Department has provided guidance in the form of questions and answers to state education authorities on how to administer Chapter 1 remedial-education programs for religious school students, following the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in *Aguilar v. Felton*.

Following are excerpts from the guidelines.

Q. Are Chapter 1 programs on nonreligious private school premises affected by the *Aguilar v. Felton* decision?

A. No.

Q. Does the term "teacher" as used in *Aguilar v. Felton* include other public school personnel?

A. The second circuit opinion affirmed by the Supreme Court in *Aguilar* forbade "the use of federal funds to send public school teachers and other professionals into religious schools to carry on instruction, remedial or otherwise, or to provide clinical and guidance services." However, the Supreme Court in an earlier case, *Wolman v. Walter*, distinguished the role of the diagnostician from that of the teacher or counselor with regard to services in private school. We view testing to select children as part of diagnosis; hence, on-premises testing for student selection is not prohibited under *Aguilar*.

Q. If a local education agency's (LEA's) application does not provide for equitable services to private school children, may an SEA approve it?

A. No. Furthermore, the LEA has no authority to expend funds until the SEA approves the application.

Q. How are the services to private school children to be monitored by the LEA and the SEA?

A. The LEA and the SEA must monitor services for private school students in the same way they monitor services for public school children. In addition, the SEA must ensure that equitable services are provided to private school students.

Q. Who is responsible for planning and implementing the Chapter 1 program for private school children?

A. An LEA must plan to provide Chapter 1 services to private school children "in consultation with private school officials." However, the decision as to what to propose in its application rests with the LEA, and the decision as to what to approve rests with the SEA.

Q. What criteria should an LEA and SEA consider to determine equitability?

A. The public and private school children must be considered as participating in the same project, not different projects—for which those children, all at certain grade levels, are selected on the basis of similar measures of educational need. The "equity" of services for private school children can be assessed only by comparing those services to those provided for public school children. The services may be considered equitable if—

★ The LEA assesses, addresses and evaluates the private school children's specific needs and their educational progress on the same basis as public school children.

★ The LEA provides, in the aggregate, about the same amount of instructional time and materials for each private school child as compared with each public school child.

★ The instructional services cost about the same. Chapter 1 requires "equal" expenditures for private and public school students. Thus, the cost per eligible child must be considered in determining equitability. However, cost is not the sole means for determining equitability.

★ The private school child has an opportunity to participate equitably to the opportunity of a public school child. In one school district, the opportunity may be at another site during the school day. In another, it may be outside of regular hours. Any alternative must be evaluated in light of local conditions. Other factors should be considered, including the level of educational services, the age of the children to be served, the time lost in travel, availability of transportation, distance, weather, supervision, safety and the opportunity and the rate of participation.

Q. May an LEA revise its program for public school students so that it is equitable with that for private school students?

A. Yes. In some cases, it may be necessary to adjust the manner in which services are provided to public school students.

Q. If providing off-premises services requires additional costs, such as those for transportation, space or administration, do they come from the LEA's whole Chapter 1 allocation or from that part of the LEA's Chapter 1 allocation which would normally go to service private school students?

A. These additional costs would come from the LEA's whole allocation, so that Chapter 1 instructional services may be provided on an equitable basis to both public and private school children.

Q. Where an LEA provides Chapter 1 services to nonpublic school children in public schools, may the LEA charge Chapter 1 a reasonable amount for the space used?

A. Yes. Reasonable and necessary costs for public school space for the instruction of nonpublic school students are allowable. Reasonable and necessary costs are those in excess of what an LEA would incur in the absence of Chapter 1. For example, a classroom in a building already in use would not be an excess cost. Special costs incurred in preparing and maintaining it for occupancy for Chapter 1 would be allowable. Any such costs would be considered administrative and would come from the LEA's whole Chapter 1 allocation—not the portion for the instructional services to private school children.

Q. If private school officials consider the Chapter 1 program offered by the LEA to be inequitable, what can they do?

A. They may complain to the LEA. If no satisfactory action is taken, they may complain to the SEA. If still no satisfactory action is taken, they may complain to the Secretary. If appropriate, the Secretary takes the steps necessary to invoke a by-pass [in which the department provides services directly to the religious school students, and deducts the appropriate costs from an LEA's allocation].

For further information, contact your program specialist.

Chapter 1 Workshops: Past and Future

The 1985 ECIA Chapter 1 Fall Workshop at Big Sky, September 25-27, was attended by 520 persons, a bear sow and two cubs. Twenty-nine workshop sessions were conducted by 2 National Diffusion Network trainers, 19 persons from 13 local Chapter 1 projects and 4 Office of Public Instruction staff members. Coffee was the most popular beverage and 2,000 cups were consumed.

Plans for future Chapter 1 workshops include the following:

Spring, 1986	April 29	Helena, Coach House East
Fall, 1986	October 8-10	Great Falls Sheraton

Chapter 1 Administration

The National Institute of Education was contracted by the U.S. Congress to conduct a nationwide study of Chapter 1. The study will be used by Congress as the only data gathered for re-authorization of ECIA Chapter 1. Reauthorization for Chapter 1 begins in the fall of 1986 with passage of legislation scheduled for spring of 1987.

Montana was selected to participate in the study. The component we participated in was Chapter 1 state administration. Two research staff members from ABT Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts, visited Montana in mid-November. They may or may not return to our state this spring to interview local school districts. When it is completed, the study will be made available to states and local school districts.

Recent questions by federal auditors regarding the Tydings Amendment have been cleared up by congressional action. Auditors had claimed that states and LEAs were violating the Tydings Amendment (concerning carry-over) by not having all final reports and refunds completed within the 27-month period. Congressional action has provided guidance to state education agencies (SEAs) so that each state will have reasonable time to complete all reports regarding the expenditure of Chapter 1 funds.

Montana has a total of 170 local Chapter 1 projects and nine state agency institutions. The total allocation for Montana for 1985-86 is \$10,444,356.

Inservice Survey

Preliminary plans have been made to hold the 1986 ECIA Chapter 1 Fall Workshop at the Great Falls Sheraton, October 8-10, 1986. Financial constraints again dictate a single statewide workshop, and we are working to provide another quality conference.

Your assistance is requested in determining the topics you would like to see presented at this conference. Please check the topics which you feel should be presented at the fall workshop.

Grade Level

	1-6	7-8	9-12	
1.	_____	_____	_____	Reading comprehension
2.	_____	_____	_____	Reading diagnosis and prescription
3.	_____	_____	_____	Content area reading skills
4.	_____	_____	_____	Integrating reading and written language instruction
5.	_____	_____	_____	Language arts
6.	_____	_____	_____	Motivation
7.	_____	_____	_____	Math instruction
8.	_____	_____	_____	Math diagnosis and prescription
9.	_____	_____	_____	Recordkeeping techniques
10.	_____	_____	_____	NDN presentations
11.	_____	_____	_____	Computers
12.	_____	_____	_____	Research in effective programs and techniques
13.	_____	_____	_____	Organizational tactics—scheduling, etc.
14.	_____	_____	_____	Various program designs
15.	_____	_____	_____	IEP development based on diagnosis
16.	_____	_____	_____	Other _____

Assistance is also requested in designing the format for the workshop sessions. Please check the option that would be most convenient for your district:

1. _____ Option 1: 2-½ days (as at Big Sky)
Day one (full): NDN, Chapter 1 administration, new to Chapter 1
Day two (full) and
Day three (half): Instructional workshops provided by successful projects in Montana
2. _____ Option 2: 1-½ days
Day one (full): Instructional workshops using Montana projects
Day two (half): Administrative, legal requirements
3. _____ Option 3: 1-½ days
Day one (full) and
Day two (half): Instructional workshops provided by successful projects in Montana
4. _____ Evening sessions providing the following:

5. _____ Other _____